

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 15-17, 23 and 24 are amended, claim 22 is canceled without prejudice, and claims 1-8, 10-12, 15-17, 20, 21, 23, and 24 remain in the application for consideration. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification, among other places, in paragraph 81. In view of the remarks and amendments presented herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Applicant makes no representation that the cited references are prior art. This response and any remarks or comments included herein are not intended to be, and are not to be interpreted as, an admission that any cited references are prior art. Applicant reserves the right to dispose of any cited reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103, including but not limited to antedating any one or more of the cited references.

Rejections under § 101

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 15, 16, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, specifically transitory media (*Office Action* p. 3). Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, these claims have been amended to recite “computer storage medium device” to clarify that a computer storage medium is not transitory. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification, among other places, in paragraphs 36 and 37. Further, Applicant submits for the record that the term “computer storage medium device” as recited in the claims does not include propagating signals and carrier waves. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1-8, 10-12, 15, 16, 23, and 24 as presently recited satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10-12, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028610 to Pearson (“Pearson”), in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0050976 to Block, et al. (“Block”), and further in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0068524 to Aboulhosn, et al. (“Aboulhosn”), and still further in view of US Patent No. 6,670,970 to Bonura, et al. (“Bonura”).

Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Block and Aboulhosn, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0187924 to Riddle (“Riddle”).

Claims 17, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Block and further in view of Aboulhosn.

Claims 3, 4, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Block, Aboulhosn, and Bonura, and further in view of Riddle.

The Claims

Independent claim 1 is amended, and as amended recites [added language is indicated in underline] a computer storage medium device comprising computer executable code that is executable by a computing device to cause to be displayed a graphical user interface, the graphical user interface comprising:

- a group space associated with a first member of a group and at least one other member of the group, the group space comprising a first display area for providing an appearance of a shared file location which the group member and the at least one other member of the group may access;
- a first control located in a second display area selectable by the first member to select at least one task associated with the group space and to activate one or more operations with respect to files displayed in the first display area, such that the at least one other member of the group is automatically shown the result of the one or more

operations performed with respect to the files displayed in the first display area;

- a selectable indicator for visually presenting a group member list to the first member of the group, the group member list including a plurality of group members, an indication field of a role for each of the plurality of group members, and one or more indications reflecting whether each of the plurality of group members is currently online;
- a second control located in the second display area, the second control including a drop-down menu selectable by the first member of the group for defining one of a plurality of roles for the at least one other member of the group;
- a visual indication that is configured to identify instances of content as new content to at least two of the plurality of group members based on the instances of content being added or changed within a predetermined period of time, the visual indication being presented on visual representations of the instances of content; and
- a third control allowing selection by the first member of the group of the predetermined period of time to be used to identify the instances of content as new content.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Pearson in view of Block and further in view of Aboulhosn and still further in view of Bonura. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify its recited subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 1 cannot be established based on the cited combination of references for at least the reason that the cited references, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 1.

For example, the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least the features of (emphasis added):

- a visual indication that is configured to identify instances of content as new content to at least two of the plurality of group members based on the instances of content being added or changed within a predetermined period of time, the visual indication being presented on visual representations of the instances of content; and

- a third control allowing selection by the first member of the group of the predetermined period of time to be used to identify the instances of content as new content.

5 In the Office Action, the Office argues that:

10 Bonura expressly teaches ... a visual indication that identifies instances of content as new content based on the instances of content being added or changed within a predetermined period of time, and a third control allowing selection by the first member of the group of the predetermined period of time to be used to identify the instances of content as new content (figs. 4, 6 and 7(a)-7(d); col. 3, lines 40-55; col. 5, lines 41-67; col. 6, lines 1-28 ...). Office Action at page 8.

15 The cited sections of Bonura only describe providing “floating windows” with visual and manipulative qualities. Bonura at col. 3, lines 42-43. For example, Bonura describes that a window that *has not* been updated with new information within a predetermined period of time *will be visually manipulated*, such that the window will gradually become translucent and any underlying windows will
20 thereby become visible to the user. Bonura at col. 3, lines 43-47. However, Bonura only indicates that windows become translucent at a display that corresponds to the inactive user. The visual manipulation of a window displayed for one inactive user, however, fails to teach or suggest “a visual indication that is configured to identify instances of content as new content to at least two of the
25 plurality of group members” as recited by amended claim 1. Moreover, visually manipulating a window responsive to *inaction* over time teaches against a visual indication “based on the instances of content being *added or changed*” as recited in claim 1.

30 Finally, Bonura is completely silent regarding “a third control allowing selection by the first member of the group of the predetermined period of time to be used to identify the instances of content as new content”. The examiner argues that Bonura discusses “setting the time period to any desired value by user”, however, the cited portions of Bonura are devoid of any discussion pertaining to

such a control. A window that becomes translucent over a predetermined time, as discussed in Bonura, simply fails to correspond to this feature of claim 1. Bonura, therefore, does not teach or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of claim 1.

5 For at least this reason, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 1 cannot be established based on the cited combination of references and claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-8 and 10-12 depend from claim 1 and thus are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their
10 own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and stand rejected as being obvious over Pearson in view of Block and further in view of Aboulhosn and still further in view of Bonura and still further in view of Riddle. As discussed above, however,
15 a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 1 cannot be established based on the combination of Pearson, Block, Aboulhosn, and Bonura. The addition of Riddle fails to remedy the deficiencies of Pearson, Block, Aboulhosn, and Bonura. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claims 3 and 4 are allowable.

20 **Independent claim 15** is amended, and as amended recites [added language is indicated in underline] a computer storage medium device comprising computer executable code that is executable by a computing device to cause to be displayed a graphical user interface, the graphical user interface comprising:

- 25
- a first shared space display area for a first member of a group and at least one other member of the group, the first shared space display area being configured to receive a drop of a file icon and further being configured to, responsive to the drop of the file icon in the first shared space display area, cause the file icon and a visual indication presented on the file icon that identifies the file icon as being associated with new content to become visible in a different
- 30

graphical user interface associated with the at least one other member of the group,

- wherein a shared file associated with the file icon may be retrieved by selecting the file icon, and wherein the first shared space display area includes at least one visible task item selectable by the first member of the group to activate an operation to be performed with respect to the first shared space display area;
- a selectable indicator for visually presenting a list of members of the group to the first member of the group, the list of members of the group including an indication field of a role for each member in the list of members of the group, the list of members of the group also including indicia reflecting, for each member of the group, whether the member of the group is currently connected to a network associated with the group; and
- a control for selecting one of a plurality of roles for the at least one other member of the group.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Pearson in view of Block and further in view of Aboulhossn and still further in view of Riddle. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicant has amended claim 15 to include subject matter from claim 23. Accordingly, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 15 cannot be established based on the references of record for at least the reason that the references, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 15.

For example, the references fail to teach or suggest at least the feature of (emphasis added):

- a first shared space display area for a first member of a group and at least one other member of the group, the first shared space display area being configured to receive a drop of a file icon and further being configured to, responsive to the drop of the file icon in the first shared space display area, cause the file icon and a visual indication presented on the file icon that identifies the file icon as being associated with new content to become visible in a different graphical user interface associated with the at least one other member of the group.

The Office relies on Bonura at column 2, lines 1-23 and column 6, lines 1-28 as allegedly providing a basis for “an indication of new content” and asserts that Bonura discusses indicating an opaque status when file content is changed within a predetermined amount of time. Office Action at page 22. As discussed above, however, Bonura only indicates that windows become translucent at a display that corresponds to an inactive user. The visual manipulation of a window displayed *for one inactive user*, however, fails to teach or suggest a first shared display space that is configured to “cause the file icon and *a visual indication* presented on the file icon *that identifies the file icon as being associated with new content* to become *visible in a different graphical user interface associated with the at least one other member of the group*” as recited by amended claim 15.

Moreover, visually manipulating a window responsive to inaction over time teaches away from causing a file icon and a visual indication presented on the file icon content to become visible “responsive to the drop of the file icon in the first shared space display area” as recited by amended claim 15. The references of record simply do not teach or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of claim 15.

For at least this reason, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 15 cannot be established based on the cited combination of references and claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 16, 23, and 24 depend from claim 15 and thus are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 15, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

Claims 23 and 24 depend from claim 15 and stand rejected as being obvious over Pearson in view of Block and further in view of Aboulhosn and still further in view of Bonura and still further in view of Riddle. As discussed above, however, a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 15 cannot be established based on the combination of Pearson, Block, Aboulhosn, and Riddle.

The addition of Bonura fails to remedy the deficiencies of Pearson, Block, Aboulhossn, and Riddle. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claims 23 and 24 are allowable.

5 **Independent claim 17** is amended, and as amended recites a method comprising [added language is indicated in underline]:

- 10 • causing to be displayed to a first user via a first user display a group folder object having associated therewith a first selectable task for forming a group;
- transmitting a request to join the group by sending a communication over a network for receipt by a computing device associated with at least one other user to initiate a group communication session between the first user and the at least one other user;
- 15 • receiving from the computing device associated with the at least one other user a response to the request, the response including a unique numeric identifier associated with the at least one other user;
- causing to be displayed a first selectable indicator for visually presenting a group member list to the first user, the group member list including an indication field of a role for each of the members in the group member list and indicia reflecting for each member of the group whether the member of the group is currently connected to the network;
- 20 • causing to be displayed a second selectable indicator that is selectable to select between a first mode in which files from a group space associated with the group are copied to the computing device associated with the at least one other user in response to a demand for the files from the at least one other user, and a second mode in which files from the group space are automatically copied to the computing device associated with the at least one other user in response to the files being added to the group space; and
- 25 • causing to be displayed an indication of a file added to the group space by the first user, the group space being configured to cause the indication of the file to be displayed to the at least one other user with a new content indicator that indicates that the file was added or modified within a predetermined period of time, the new content indicator being configured to be visually presented on the indication of the file added to the group space.
- 30
- 35

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Pearson in view of Block and further in view of Aboulhosn. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicant has amended claim 17 to include subject matter from claim 22 (now canceled). Accordingly, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 17 cannot be established based on the references of record for at least the reason that the references, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 17.

For example, the references fail to teach or suggest at least the features of (emphasis added):

- causing to be displayed an indication of a file added to the group space by the first user, the group space being configured to cause the indication of the file to be displayed to the at least one other user with a new content indicator that indicates that the file was added or modified within a predetermined period of time, the new content indicator being configured to be visually presented on the indication of the file added to the group space.

In the Office Action, the Office asserts that Bonura discusses:

[D]isplaying an indication of a file added to the group space by the first use, the indication of the file being displayed with a new content indicator that indicates that the file was added or modified within a predetermined period of time (col. 6 lines 1-28: indication of file changing as a new content by means of changing opaque status). Office Action at page 21.

However, a review of these sections of Bonura, and in fact the entirety of the reference, can find no mention of the above-mentioned feature of claim 17. The cited sections of Bonura simply discuss that windows become translucent at a display that corresponds to the inactive user. Nowhere, however, does Bonura teach or suggest an indication of a file added to a group space “displayed to the at least one other user with a new content indicator that indicates that the file was

added or modified within a predetermined period of time” as recited by amended claim 17.

For at least this reason, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 17 cannot be established based on the cited combination of references and claim 17 is allowable.

Claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 17 and thus are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 17, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowability. If the Office’s next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 30 September 2011

By: /Christopher J. Culberson/
Christopher J. Culberson
Reg. No. 59,136

Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399
Direct telephone (425) 707-9382